DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 343 096 CS 010 870

AUTHOR Herrmann, Beth Ann; Sarracino, Jeri
TITLE Restructuring a Preservice Literacy Methods Course: Dilemmas and Lessons Learned.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Dec 91
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference (41st, Palm Springs, CA, December 3-7, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Course Organization; Educational Research; Higher Education; *Instructional Effectiveness; *Literacy; *Methods Courses; *Preservice Teacher Education; Reading Instruction; Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS *Reflective Inquiry

ABSTRACT

A study examined an initial effort to restructure the content, format, and instruction of a preservice literacy methods course and the effect it had on 13 preservice teachers relative to their movement toward reflective inquiry and practice in literacy teaching. Data were collected from the preservice teachers using questionnaires, journals, informal conversations, reflective essays, field notes, and conferences and were analyzed using a constant comparative method. Results indicated considerable variation among the preservice teachers relative to cognitive, social, and emotional shifts, and showed that only a few preservice teachers made extensive movement toward reflective inquiry and practice. Findings suggest that breaking free from tradition at the teacher education level is a trial-and-error process. (One table describing the cognitive, social, and emotional shifts of the preservice teachers is included; 26 references are attached.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED343096

Restructuring a Preservice Literacy Methods Course:

Dilemmas and Lessons Learned

Beth Ann Herrmann
College of Education
Wardlaw 203
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208
(803) 777-4836
FAX (803) 777-3068

Jeri Sarracino
College of Education
Wardlaw 213
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208
(803) 777-4836
FAX (803) 777-3068

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Beth Ann Herrmann

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

RUNNING HEAD: Restructuring a Preservice Literacy Methods Course

CS010870

Note: This work is sponsored by a $49,973 U.S. Department of Education Student Literacy Corps Grant. The authors acknowledge the assistance of Donna Alvermann, Lorin Anderson, Tom Bird, Gerry Duffy, John Guthrie, Richard Ishler and Barak Rosenshine for comments on a draft of this manuscript, the data analysis assistance of Margaret Caroon and manuscript preparation by Cindy Grugan.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This article describes an initial effort to restructure the content, format and instruction of a preservice literacy methods course and the effect it had on thirteen preservice teachers relative to their movement toward reflective inquiry and practice in literacy teaching. Data were collected from the preservice teachers using questionnaires, journals, informal conversations, reflective essays, field notes and conferences and analyzed using a constant comparative method. Considerable variation was observed among the preservice teachers relative to cognitive, social and emotional shifts. These shifts are explored along with dilemmas we encountered and lessons we learned about teacher education restructuring and understanding the subtleties of teacher change.

Restructuring a Preservice Literacy Methods Course: Dilemmas and Lessons Learned

Encouraging preservice teachers to be reflective practitioners is a high priority in virtually every teacher education program in the U.S.A., but as Gore and Zeichner (1991) point out, there are still many unanswered questions regarding what preservice teachers should be reflective about and how best to encourage and support reflective teaching. This article addresses these issues as they relate to encouraging and supporting preservice teacher reflective inquiry and practice in literacy teaching.

With support from the U.S. Department of Education Student Literacy Corps Program we are working within the context of a restructured preservice literacy methods course to encourage and support reflective inquiry and practice in literacy teaching. A major component of the course is an after school literacy tutoring program for at-risk children and their parents, which provides the context for authentic literacy teaching and collaboration and collegiality among teacher educators, preservice teachers and graduate students. During the 1990-1991 academic school year we worked in partnership with twenty preservice teachers and nine graduate students enrolled in the course to explore the preservice teachers' movement toward reflective inquiry and practice. At this point we still have many unanswered questions about our restructuring effort and the effect it had on our preservice teachers, but we would like to describe what we tried to do during the first year of our project, particularly dilemmas we encountered and what we learned.

Background

The need to restructure our preservice literacy methods course stemmed from a

basic concern for what we were accomplishing and not accomplishing with our students. We wanted our preservice teachers to become creative, reflective and adaptive literacy teachers (Duffy, 1991), but most of them did not. Instead, they tried to adopt our theoretical perspectives and mimic instructional actions we focused on because that is what they thought they were supposed to do during methods courses.

We wanted to develop a course that would promote reflection, provide a professional learning community and encourage adaptive teaching, but at the same time we recognized that our students and our traditions posed some complications. For example, most of our preservice teachers come to us with "absorptionist" views of learning; they expect us to tell them what to do with little effort or thinking on their part (Lockhead, 1985). In addition, most of them believe that someone else knows more about teaching than they do; they do not see themselves as equal partners in the process of learning about teaching. Finally, it is generally expected that we will "cover" a prescribed amount of material in our course to adequately prepare our students for national examinations as well as state-mandated performance evaluations. We realized we would be dealing, first hand, with these complications on a daily basis during our project, but we were committed to creating a learning environment that would lead to substantive and lasting change in the way our preservice teachers thought about literacy and literacy teaching.

We made four major changes in the content, format and instruction of our course. First, we shifted the focus of the content from an emphasis on specific literacy topics (e.g., word recognition) to an emphasis on reflective inquiry and practice (Zeichner & Liston, 1990) relative to various theories influencing the literacy field -- skills-based theories (Samuels & Kamil, 1984), cognitive theories (Fredericksen, 1984), metacognitive theories (Baker & Brown, 1984) and the whole language philosophy (Goodman, 1989). Second, we enlisted graduate

student mentors for the preservice teachers and extended the length of our course to one academic school year by combining and integrating two semester-long graduate and two semester-long undergraduate literacy methods courses. Third, we created an after-school literacy tutoring program for children experiencing literacy difficulties and their parents, which provided the basis for authentic teaching experiences (Holmes Group, 1990) and collegiality and collaboration (see Herrmann & Sarracino, 1991 for a description of the tutoring program). Fourth, we shifted our instruction from a top-down, how-to methods course approach to a conceptually oriented view of teaching (Prawat, 1989). As such, we encouraged conversation, experience, interpretation, criticism, engagement, voice, participation, and equal parity (Holmes Group, 1990; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1990; Ellis, 1990). We assumed new roles as teacher educators within this environment (a) focusing on a few central ideas or understandings, (b) challenging our students while also shaping their knowledge, and (c) adapting our instruction on the basis of on-going analyses of student progress. We expected our students to assume new roles as well whereby they would take risks and take charge of their learning.

The major goal of the restructured course was for the preservice teachers to broaden their conceptual understandings and theoretical perspectives on literacy teaching and learn how to engage in responsive instructional actions. As such, the course emphasized dialectical discourse (Roby, 1988), critical reflection (Van manen, 1977) and authentic teaching experiences. The course was conducted in four phases. Phase I (August, 1990-September, 1990) consisted of twelve two-hour, bi-weekly university-based class sessions during which we facilitated large and small group conversations about articles from the professional literature describing the theories mentioned earlier and videotaped instructional segments representing each theory. Emphasis was placed on how the theories are influencing the literacy field, the "competing" nature of the theories, and the extent to which

instruction grounded in the theories accomplishes (a) attitude outcomes - developing accurate conceptual understandings of reading and writing and a positive response to reading and writing; (b) content outcomes - understanding what you read and writing coherent text; and (c) process outcomes - developing awareness and control of reasoning processes associated with effective reading and writing (Duffy & Roehler, 1989). Phase II (October, 1990-December, 1990) consisted of twelve two-hour. bi-weekly, school-based tutoring sessions during which teams of preservice teachers, coached by their mentors, taught small groups of children (grades 1-9) and the children's parents. Our role during the tutoring phase was to help the preservice teachers work through thoughtful analyses of their own lessons through professional dialogue (Hargreaves & Dawe, 1990). Phase III (January, 1991) consisted of four two-hour, bi-weekly university-based class sessions during which the preservice teachers and their mentors reflected on their tutoring experiences and planned for the upcoming tutoring phase. Phase IV (February, 1991-April, 1991) consisted of fifteen tutoring sessions and three seminar sessions similar to those described earlier. Across all four phases of the course we attempted to establish a middle ground (Bereiter, 1985) between explicit teaching (Duffy et al., 1987), whereby we intervened to provide specific information and/or clarify misconceptions, and discovery learning (Anderson & Smith, 1987), through which the preservice teachers worked to clarify their own misconceptions.

A Collaborative Exploration of the Preservice Teachers' Movement Toward Reflective Inquiry and Practice

We worked in partnership with the preservice teachers and the graduate students enrolled in the year-long course to explore the preservice teachers' movement toward reflective inquiry and practice. We were particularly interested in the preservice teachers' overall reaction to the restructured course and changes in

their conceptual understandings and theoretical perspectives about literacy teaching and their instructional actions. Symbolic interactionism (Blumer, 1969), which assumes that the meaning of things is derived from the social interactions humans have with others, provided the theoretical basis for the study.

Subjects

Thirteen preservice teachers who completed all four phases of the course were targeted for our investigation. We eliminated from our investigation seven preservice teachers who did not complete all four phases of the course due to reasons beyond our control (e.g., illness and schedule conflicts). The target teachers were all pursuing initial certification, in either early childhood or elementary education, and all had completed approximately 100 credit hours of general education requirements as well as three preprofessional education core courses.

Data Collection

Data were collected over a ten month period (August, 1990 - May 1991). We used a variety of techniques to collect primary data: (a) pre and post concept questionnaires designed to describe changes in conceptual understandings about literacy and literacy instruction (Herrmann & Duffy, 1989), (b) lesson questionnaires designed to describe changes in the preservice teacher's instructional actions, (c) professional journals, (d) informal conversations, (e) reflective essays about conceptual understandings and theoretical perspectives of literacy instruction and (f) our own field notes. We collected secondary data by recording notes during individual conferences we conducted at the end of the course with the preservice teachers and their mentors.

Data Analysis

We used the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) both during and after data collection to develop a better understanding of the preservice

teachers' movement toward reflective inquiry and practice. Beginning with the first week of the study we independently read and jointly discussed each preservice teacher's data file on a weekly basis creating and refining general hypotheses about each preservice teacher as new data were added to each data set. This procedure continued until the last piece of data was collected during the final week of the year-long course.

The following procedure was used after the data collection process to reduce the data into categories and properties to further explore our initial hypotheses about the preservice teachers. First, using the initial hypotheses as a guide for searching the data, we independently read and coded each data set, examining the data for specific change patterns. Coding consisted of marginal notes, underlining and boxing chunks of information. From emerging change patterns we independently generated theoretical categories (conceptual elements arising from patterns in the data) and properties (smaller, definable aspects of the categories). As independent coding proceeded, categories were collapsed and properties were integrated. When new incidents from the data no longer added new properties to the categories, the categories were considered saturated. Second, we compared and discussed independently generated categories and properties refining them until 100% agreement was established. Third, using the agreed upon categories as a guide, we jointly read and discussed each preservice teacher's data file deliberately searching for disconfirming evidence for each category. We modified and refined the categories as disconfirming evidence was noted. Fourth, after each data set had been jointly read and discussed and we were relatively satisfied that the categories and properties reflected our joint interpretations of change for each preservice teacher, we trangulated the secondary data - notes recorded during individual conferences - with our interpretations. We worked to understand discrepancies and commonalties between our interpretations and the primary and secondary data,

further modifying and refining the categories until 100% agreement was again established. Finally we jointly examined similarities and differences among the preservice teachers relative to the types of shifts we observed and the magnitude of the shifts (a lot, some, little or none) and grouped the preservice teachers on the basis of this final examination.

Validity and Reliability

During the initial phase of data analysis we examined validity of inferences we made about each data file in two ways. First, we frequently engaged in conversations with the preservice teachers and the graduate students about our evolving understandings. For example, at one point in the study it became apparent that two of the preservice teachers working together as a team were becoming more independent in making decisions about their lessons. Informal conversations with the preservice teachers as well as their mentor substantiated our hunch. Second, we frequently conversed with four preservice teachers who enrolled in the course at the beginning of Phase III. Our intent during these conversations was to substantiate interactions and events observed earlier during Phases I and II (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984).

We examined validity and reliability of the categories and properties jointly created during the final phase of data analysis by enlisting an external coder who was familiar with the research effort, but not directly involved with the study as a check on our interpretations. The following procedure was used. First, we explained that the purpose of the study was to explore the preservice teachers' movement toward reflective inquiry and practice, making certain the external coder understood our conceptual understandings of these terms. Second, we explained and discussed the categories and properties until the external coder understood our conceptual understandings of each one. Third, the external coder was asked to read six data sets randomly selected from the thirteen and code each one using the

categories and properties. Immediately following the completion of this task we compared and discussed our interpretations of the same data sets with the external coder, refining the categories and properties until 100% agreement was established. Fourth, we systematically selected similar and different incidents from the remaining seven data sets, presented each one to the external coder who then was asked to (a) classify each incident using the categories and properties, and (b) state a rationale for each classification. Once again, we compared and discussed our interpretations with the interpretations of the external coder, refining the categories and properties until 100% agreement was established.

We examined reliability of the change patterns we observed within each category for each preservice teacher by enlisting the graduate student mentors who had spent more time than we had in actual teaching situations with the preservice teachers. The mentors were given a written explanation of each category and property and the data files of the preservice teachers they worked with and asked to review the files indicating the extent to which they thought change had occurred within each category (a lot, some, little or none). We intended for the mentors to provide a check on our possible biases. As such, in some cases where the mentors disagreed with our interpretations, we deferred judgment to them if they were able to provide convincing supportive evidence for their decisions. The procedure yielded an 89 percent level of agreement.

Results

Table 1, shows the categories and properties that emerged from our analysis of the data and three groups of preservice teachers we created on the basis of our examination of similarities and differences in the shifts we observed. Three major categories emerged: (a) cognitive shifts, defined as changes in conceptual understandings of literacy teaching, (b) social shifts, defined as changes in

association or interaction with peers, parents and students, and (c) emotional shifts defined as changes in affective aspects of literacy teaching. Properties that reflected cognitive shifts had to do with changes in how the preservice teachers conceptualized (a) the content of instruction [i.e., what should be taught], (b) instructional focus [i.e., what should be emphasized], (c) instructional strategies [i.e., how literacy should be taught], (d) instructional materials [i.e., what should be used], (e) the role of the teacher [i.e., what the teacher should do] and (f) the role of the students [i.e., what the student should do]. Properties that reflected social shifts had to do with changes in collegiality and collaboration [i.e., ability to work jointly with others to develop and implement a literacy program], and professionalism [i.e., conduct, appearance, mannerisms, and responsibilities associated with literacy teaching]. Properties that reflected emotional shifts had to do with changes in confidence [i.e., consciousness of feeling sure in developing and implementing a literacy program], and empowerment [i.e., assumes authority as a literacy teacher]. Group 1 preservice teachers experienced a lot of change across all three categories, Group 2 preservice teachers experienced some change, and Group 3 preservice teachers experienced little or no change.

Insert Table 1 about here

In the following sections we describe in more detail the types of shifts we observed within each category for each group.

Group 1: A Lot of Change

Five of the preservice teachers made extensive movement toward reflective inquiry and practice as evidenced by the noted shifts in their theoretical perspectives and their instructional actions (Table 1). For example, at the beginning of the course all five of these preservice teachers thought literacy lessons should focus on

specific skills for the purpose of helping students learn how to pronounce words and understand text. They thought lessons should be fun (i.e., games; stories), but they also thought some drill-and-practice should be provided using worksheet-type materials. They thought the role of the literacy teacher was to transmit information about reading skills and assist students with tasks and the role of the student was to absorb the information and complete tasks/activities. By the end of the course however, these preservice teachers thought literacy lessons should focus on metacognitive thinking, cognitive strategies and useful skills for the purpose of developing thinking and understanding. They conceptualized authentic and purposeful reading and writing experiences utilizing teacher and student selected materials as the primary means through which the teacher accomplishes this goal. They thought the teacher should be both an instructional leader and a facilitator, providing information and guiding learning, and that students should be actively involved in lessons. From the beginning to the end of the course, these preservice teachers learned how to form collaborative relationships with their teacher partners and they gradually became less dependent on their mentors and on us. As they became more independent and self-reliant, taking risks with more confidence and making their own instructional decisions. By the end of the course these preservice teachers had begun to think of themselves as literacy teachers rather than university students.

Group 2: Some Change

Four of the preservice teachers made some movement toward reflective inquiry and practice, as evidenced by the noted shifts in their theoretical perspectives, and instructional actions, but their movement was not as extensive as the movement of their Group 1 counterparts (Table 1). By the end of the course the theoretical perspectives of these preservice teachers had broadened to some extent, but for the most part they adopted one theory - either whole language or metacognitive - and

stayed with it. Like their Group 1 counterparts at the beginning of the course, these preservice teachers conceptualized literacy teaching in terms of traditional, teacher -led, skills-based lessons. By the end of the course, however, two of these preservice teachers thought literacy lessons should focus on specific cognitive strategies while the other two thought literacy lessons should focus on children's literature and writing. At the begining of the course all four preservice teachers thought instruction should consist of drill and practice on specific skills. By the end of the course, however, they thought instruction should consist of authentic, but not necessarily purposeful, reading and writing experiences utilizing teacher selected children's literature. The two preservice teachers who thought literacy lessons should focus on cognitive strategies did not change their view of the role of the teacher; they still tended to view the teacher's role as transmitting information. The two preservice teachers who thought literacy lessons should focus on children's literature and writing, however, shifted their view of the role of the teacher from transmitting information to facilitating activities. All four preservice teachers' views of the role of the student shifted from passive recipients of information to active participants in lesson activities. From the beginning to the end of the course these preservice teachers learned how to collaborate with their teaching partners, but they fluctuated between dependence and independence as far as their mentors and we were concerned, particularly during the tutoring phases of the course. They occasionally took "safe risks" and made their own instructional decisions, but for the most part they depended on their mentors or us to tell them what to do. By the end of the course these preservice teachers had developed a more positive view of themselves as literacy teachers, but they weren't quite reading to let go of the safety of their university student roles.

Group 3: Little or No Change

Four of the preservice teachers made only slight movement toward reflective

inquiry and practice as evidenced by the noted lack of change in their theoretical perspectives and slight change in their instructional actions (Table 1). By the end of the course their theoretical perspectives had broadened slightly, but for the most part they were more steeped in the theoretical perspectives they brought with them to the course. Like their Group 1 and 2 counterparts, at the beginning of the course, Group 3 preservice teachers conceptualized literacy teaching in terms of traditional, teacher-led skills-based lessons. Unlike their Group 1 and 2 counterparts, however, whose views of literacy teaching changed, Group 3 preservice teachers' views of literacy teaching for the most part remained the same. The most notable shift in their conceptual understandings of literacy teaching had to do with their views of instructional strategies. At the beginning of the course, Group 3 teachers thought teachers should teach skills through drill-and-practice; by the end of the course they thought skills should be taught through student-centered activities. Likewise, their views of the role of the teacher changed from that of transmitting information to facilitating activities, but there was little change in their view of the role of the student. From the beginning to the end of the course, Group 3 preservice teachers maintained cooperative rather than collaborative relationships with their teacher partners and they tended to rely on others and avoid risks. These preservice teachers did attempt to take control of their literacy program, but for the most part they remained dependent on their mentors and on us. By the end of the course Group 3 preservice teachers still viewed themselves as university students rather than literacy teachers.

Summary

During the 1990-1991 academic school year we worked in partnership with preservice teachers and graduate students within the context of a restructured preservice literacy methods course to develop a better understanding of the preservice teachers' movement toward reflective inquiry and practice in literacy

teaching. Results of our collaborative inquiry suggest that despite our emphasis on dialectical discourse, critical reflection, collaboration and authentic teaching experiences, only a few preservice teachers made extensive movement toward reflective inquiry and practice. In the next section we explore possible reasons why this occurred and what we have learned about teacher education restructuring and understanding the subtleties of teacher change.

Dilemmas and Lessons Learned

As anticipated, we found restructuring our course to be a difficult task primarily because it required us and our students to assume new roles. For example, as a reading doctoral student, preparing to be a teacher educator, I learned how to impart knowledge, espouse theories and supervise; I did not learn how to facilitate dialectical discourse or provide collegial coaching. This type of teaching was much more difficult than we thought it would be. We struggled to stay focused on a few central ideas and to maintain a balance between explicit teaching and discovery learning. On some days we seemed to lecture too much; on others we left too much to be discovered. We fought strong urges to convey theories we favored as if they were *the* theories and, while our goal was for the preservice teachers to develop their own theoretical perspectives, it was difficult to support the development of theoretical perspectives we didn't particularly favor. Likewise, during the tutoring phases of the course we struggled with strong tendencies to tell the preservice teachers what went wrong in their lessons and how to "fix" them rather than allow them to draw their own conclusions and make their own decisions. Finally, we experienced difficulty with our new instructional roles due to traditional expectations placed on us as teacher educators. For example, we were generally expected to espouse theories and impart knowledge about specific topics outlined in a standard course syllabus and we knew we would be evaluated by both our

colleagues and our students on the basis of how effectively we accomplished that.

Our preservice teachers were equally as unprepared for their new roles. For example, most of our preservice teachers experienced considerable difficulty with the notion of exploring and adapting theories; they viewed theories as absolute "truths" to be adopted or rejected. In addition, most of our preservice teachers had spent an enormous amount of time observing other teachers from the safety of their roles as university students. This was the first time many of them had to deal first hand with instructional dilemmas, and it was difficult for them. They also had trouble understanding the complex nature of literacy teaching which we attributed to an overemphasis in our teacher education program on rote teaching behaviors identified by process-product research (Brophy & Good, 1986). They had been exposed to theories of teacher thinking and decision-making, but in reality, they knew they would be evaluated during student teaching on how well they could perform certain teaching behaviors, not how well they could think or make decisions. They also believed there was a "right" way to teach literacy and they had trouble understanding why we wouldn't tell them how to do it. For example, when their lessons didn't go well, most of the preservice teachers expected us to tell them what they had done wrong and what to do and they were frustrated and angry when we didn't, as illustrated by one preservice teacher's comment on a midterm course evaluation (December, 1990).

> *"I am grateful for the experience I am getting, but I am frustrated when my lessons don't go well and you won't tell me what to do. We were not prepared for this experience!"*

Many of the preservice teachers were confused and frustrated when we tried to show them how to think through their lessons and arrive at their own conclusions and decisions, as illustrated by one preservice teacher's comment during a coaching session (November, 1990).

> *"I'm fighting to stay alive out here. Don't ask me to think too!"*

Finally, some of the preservice teachers struggled with developing self confidence and positive images of themselves as literacy teachers. For example, during Phase I, they frequently put themselves down when they became confused, as evidenced by one preservice teacher's comment during a class discussion (September, 1990).

> *"Boy, I guess I must really be dumb. I don't understand anything we are talking about!"*

They also had a tendency to put themselves down when it came to working with the parents, as illustrated by one preservice teacher's journal entry the week before the tutoring program (October, 1990).

> *"They're going to be looking to me for answers why their child can't read! I'm just a student. . . how should I know?"*

Another preservice teacher expressed it another way (October, 1990).

"No one ever taught me how to talk to an adult before!"

We have learned much from our initial efforts to restructure our course and understand what effect it had on our preservice teachers. Overall, we have learned that change at the teacher education level is just as tedious and painfully slow as it is at the classroom level. Our restructured course represents a totally different way of thinking about teaching prospective literacy teachers and a totally different way of thinking about learning how to be literacy teachers -- a radical departure from tradition -- and that will take time. Old habits are hard to break. It will take time for us to learn how to lead rather than control; how to explore rather than espouse; and how to balance explicit teaching with discovery learning. Likewise, it will take time for our students to learn how to take risks rather than play it safe; how to actively construct knowledge rather than absorb it; and how to study and learn from their teaching. Equally as important, however, we have learned that it will take time for an instructional approach that puts students, rather than professors, in charge of learning to be fully accepted within the context of a traditional teacher education environment.

We have also learned a great deal about the complexities associated with understanding teacher change within the context of a restructured teacher education classroom environment. Our collaborative approach to understanding the preservice teachers' movement toward reflective inquiry and practice represents a relatively new way of thinking about classroom-based teacher education research. We have learned that it is an incredibly time consuming process, but one that reveals important subtleties that might otherwise be overlooked. It will take time for us to sort out the complexities associated with giving objective voice to subjective interpretations of data. Equally as important, however, we have learned that it will take time for this type of approach to studying teacher change to be fully accepted as a valid means of understanding personal and professional growth.

At this point, we realize we have a long way to go toward developing our course and understanding the subtleties of teacher change within the collaborative environment we are creating, but we want to emphasize here that we are neither disappointed in nor discouraged by our initial efforts or the progress of our preservice teachers. Overall, we accomplished a great deal more toward helping our students become creative, reflective and adaptive literacy teachers than we have ever accomplished before restructuring our course. By the end of the year, most of our preservice teachers understood and appreciated what we were trying to do and why. This is perhaps best illustrated by a comment made during the final reflections conference by the same preservice teacher who's frustrating course evaluation comments we quoted earlier (May, 1990).

> *"I was so frustrated during fall semester because you wouldn't tell us what to do. . . I was mad at you! But over Christmas break I realized that it was time for me to get my act together and start growing up. I was determined to do better during spring semester. I realize now that that is exactly why you were doing what you were doing. You wanted us to learn how to think for ourselves. It took me a long time to figure that out."*

Expressing it another way, one preservice teacher said.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"This is the year I stopped being a student and started becoming a teacher."

We hope that by sharing our dilemmas we have effectively illustrated that breaking free from tradition at the teacher education level is a trial-and-error process and we hope our experiences will spark discourse among teacher educators about course restructuring and innovative ways to study teacher change. Conversations of this sort should lead to new ideas for creating new teacher education environments.

References

Anderson, C. & Smith, E. (1987). Teaching science: In V. Richardson-Koehler (Ed.), Educator's handbook: A research perspective (pp. 84-111). New York: Longman.

Baker, L. & Brown, A. (1984). Metacognitive skills and reading. In P. David Pearson (Ed.), Handbook of Reading Research. New York: Longman, 353-394.

Bereiter, C. (1985). Toward a solution of the learning paradox. Review of Educational Research, 55, 201-226.

Blumer, H. (1969). Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Brophy, J. E. & Good, T. L. (1986). Teacher behavior and student achievement. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching, 3rd Edition. New York: Macmillan.

Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S. (1990). Research on teaching and teacher research: The issues that divide. Educational Researcher, 19 (2), 2-11.

Duffy, G. (1991). What counts in teacher education? Dilemmas in empowering teachers. In J. Zutell & S. McCormick (Eds.). The 40th Yearbook of the National Reading Conference. Chicago: National Reading Conference.

Duffy, G. & Roehler, L. (1989). Improving classroom reading instruction: A decision-making approach. New York: Random House.

Duffy, G. G., Roehler, L. R., Sivan, E., Rackliffe, G., Book, C., Meloth, M., Vavrus, L. G., Wessleman, R., Putnam, J., & Bassiri, D. (1987). Effects of explaining the reasoning associated with using reading strategies. Reading Research Quarterly, 22, 347-368.

Ellis, N. (1990). Collaborative interaction for improvement of teaching. Teaching and Teacher Education, 6 (3), 267-275.

Fredericksen, N. (1984). Implications of cognitive theory for instruction in problem solving. Review of Educational Research, 54, 363-407.

Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Chicago: Aldine.

Goetz, J. P. & LeCompte, M. D. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative designing in educational research. Orlando: Academic.

Goodman, Y. (1989). Roots of the whole language-movement. Elementary School Journal, 90, 113-127.

Gore, J. M. & Zeichner, K. M. (1991). Action research and reflective teaching in preservice teacher education: A case study from the United States. Teaching and Teacher Education, 7 (2), 119-136.

Hargreaves, A. & Dawe, R. (1990). Paths of professional development: Contrived collegiality, collaborative culture, and the case of peer coaching. Teaching and Teacher Education, 6 (3), 227-241.

Herrmann, B. & Duffy, G. (1989). Relationships between teachers' conceptual understandings, teacher responsiveness and student outcomes: Two exploratory studies in teacher education settings. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Herrmann, B. A. & Sarracino, J. (1991). Student literacy through parent involvement. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Holmes Group. (1990). Tomorrow's schools. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Lockhead, T. (1985). Teaching analytic reasoning skills through pair problem-solving. In S. F. Chipman, J. W. Segal and R. Glaser (Eds.), Thinking and learning skills: Vol. 1. Relating instruction to research (pp. 109-131). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Prawat, R. (1989). Teaching for understanding: Three key attributes. Teaching and Teacher Education, 5 (4), pp. 315-328.

Roby T. (1988). Models of discussion. In J. T. Dillon (Ed.), Questioning and discussion: A multidisciplinary study (pp. 163-191). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Samuels, J. & Kamil, M. (1984). Models of the reading process. In P. David Pearson (Ed.), Handbook of Reading Research. New York: Longman, 185-224.

Van manen, M. (1977). Linking ways of knowing with ways of being practical. Curriculum Inquiry, 6, 205-228.

Zeichner, K. & Liston, D. (1990). Traditions of reform in U.S. teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 41 (2), pp. 3-20.

Table 1

Description of cognitive, social and emotional shifts among the preservice teachers from the beginning to the end of the course (August 1990-April 1991).

I. COGNITIVE SHIFTS: CHANGES IN CONCEPTUAL UNDERSTANDINGS OF LITERACY TEACHING

	GROUP 1 (N=5)	GROUP 2 (N=4)	GROUP 3 (N=4)
Content of instruction. What should be taught during literacy lessons.			
From specific skills to	metacognitive thinking; cognitive strategies; useful skills	specific cognitive strategies (N = 2) children's literature and writing (N = 2)	specific skills
Instructional focus. What should be emphasized during literacy lessons.			
From accurate pronunciation and understanding to	thinking and understanding	acquisition of specific cognitive strategies and reading for meaning (N = 2) having fun with reading and understanding (N = 2)	accurate pronunciation and understanding
Instructional strategies. How literacy should be taught.			
From student-centered activities and drill-and-practice skill lessons to	authentic and purposeful reading and writing experiences	authentic reading and writing activities	student-centered activities
Instructional materials. What should be used to teach literacy.			
From games, stories and worksheets to	teacher and student selected newspapers, books, magazines literature	teacher selected children's literature	games and activities; teacher selected children's literature
The role of the teacher. What the teacher should do to teach literacy.			
From transmit information and assist with tasks	provide information and guide learning	transmit information (N = 2) facilitate activities (N = 2)	facilitate activities
The role of the student. What the student should do to become more literate.			
Absorb information and complete tasks/ activities to	be an active participant in learning about reading and writing	be an active participant in lesson activities	be an active participant in lesson activities

II. SOCIAL SHIFTS. CHANGES IN ASSOCIATION OR INTERACTION WITH PEERS, PARENTS AND STUDENTS

	GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3
Collegiality and collaboration. Ability to work jointly with others to develop and implement a literacy program.			
From working alone to	forming collaborative, inter-dependent working relationships with teacher partners	forming collaborative, inter-dependent working relationships with teacher partners	forming cooperative working relationships with teacher partners
Professionalism. Conduct, appearance, mannerisms and responsibilities associated with literacy teaching.			
From university student to	literacy teacher	fluctuating between the role of a university student and a literacy teacher	university student

III. EMOTIONAL SHIFTS. CHANGES IN AFFECTIVE ASPECTS OF LITERACY TEACHING.

	GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3
Confidence. Consciousness of feeling sure in developing and implementing a literacy program.			
From non-self reliance to	self-reliance; exhibited self assurance in trying situations; became risk-takers	some self-reliance; fluctuating between dependence and independence in trying situations; took some risks	reliance on others in trying situations; avoided risk-taking
Empowerment. Assumes authority as a literacy teacher.			
From total dependence on teacher educators and mentors to	total independence	fluctuating between independence and dependence on teacher educators and mentors	attempted to take control of their literacy program, but remained dependent on teacher educators and mentors